



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,860	08/22/2003	Ming-Yang Chao	MTKP0031USA	1859

27765 7590 12/07/2006

NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

GUPTA, PARUL H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2627

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/604,860	Applicant(s) CHAO, MING-YANG	
	Examiner Parul Gupta	Art Unit 2627	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Regarding claim 1, applicant contends that the memory may not store a plurality of sets of write strategy parameters. The examiner disagrees. According to figures 15 and 16, as described in column 17, line 51 to column 18, line 22, many values can be stored corresponding to the different space lengths. Thus, the counter may hold different sets of write strategy parameters. Additionally, the applicant contends that the write strategy is not formed using the same parameters. The examiner disagrees. The examiner already showed the dependence of the write strategy on the length of the current pit and spaces between the pits in the previous office action. Column 6, lines 12-35 also show that the dependence is based on the written pit signal of the optical disc in the form of the pulse trains.

Regarding claim 3, applicant contends that the delay value between pulses of the recording pulse and the delay given are for different waveforms. The examiner disagrees. Column 7, lines 43-66 explain the two waveforms given in figure 3. Namely, the positional relationship is given between the trailing edge of the recording pattern to be recorded to the optical disc and the last pulse in the successive recording pulses for actually driving the laser. According to the definitions given, these values represent the same values given by the applicant.

Regarding claim 5, applicant contends that that Shoji does not teach a length of the first pulse of the write time waveform is equal to a length of twice the base period subtracting the chosen first parameter since the actual length is equal to twice the length of the base period subtracting a TF value subtracting an additional space. The examiner disagrees. The additional space may be added to TF to yield the first parameter. The value of the first pulse is still equal to twice the base period minus a given value of 0.5T.

Regarding claim 6, the applicant contends that the given figure does not provide meaningful information as only values for the first and last pulses are given. The examiner disagrees. The disclosure maintains the claims of the examiner that the length of multiple pulses is 0.5T as given in column 11, lines 49-55 and shown in the figures. Additionally, the applicant contends that it would be incorrect to say that the base period given in Shoji is 0.5T. The examiner disagrees. Although the reference period given in Shoji is T, the relationship between the length of the multiple pulses is the same as given by the applicant. Thus, 0.5T as given by Shoji yields the same result as the invention of the applicant.


WILLIAM KORZUCH

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600